

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-59 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 51, and 53 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 51, and 53. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10-28, 30, 31, 36-38, 40-49, 53, 54, and 58 are rejected. Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 29, 32-35, 39, 50-52, 55-57, and 59 are objected to.

Claim Formalities

In response to the Examiner's suggestion, the Markush language has been clarified in Claims 19, 20, 28-30, 33, 35, 36, 42-45, 47, 48, and 57.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 37, 38, 40-45, 49, 54, 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42-45, 49, and 58 have been clarified to correct antecedent basis. Claim 54 has been clarified with respect to the recitation of the Pd complex. To the extent that these rejections may still apply to the claims as amended in this Reply, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Nonstatutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10-28, 30, 31, 36, 42-48 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 87-92 of U.S. Patent No. 6,890,496. Claims 53 and 54 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 93-96 of U.S. Patent No. 6,890,496. A terminal disclaimer has been filed with this Response to obviate these rejections with respect to U.S. Patent No. 6,890,496. This is not an admission of the propriety of the rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 27, 28, 30, 31, 46-48 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of

nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 47-50 of copending Application No. 10/427,028. Claims 53, 54 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 51 of copending Application No. 10/427,028. Application No. 10/427,028 has been expressly abandoned prior to the filing of this Reply, which obviates these rejections.

Claims 1, 3, 27, 28, 30, 31, 46-48 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 47-50 of copending Application No. 10/647,104. Claims 53, 54 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 51 of copending Application No. 10/647,104. Claims 1-51 of Application No. 10/647,104 have been cancelled in an Amendment to 10/647,104 filed contemporaneously with this Reply, which obviates these rejections.

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. In the event there are additional charges in connection with the filing of this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account No. 50-0714/LYNN-0144.C of the firm of the below-signed attorney in the amount of any necessary fee.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey L. Streets, #37,453/

Jeffrey L. Streets
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,453
STREETS & STEELE
13831 Northwest Freeway, Suite 355
Houston, Texas 77040
(713)939-9444